K. S. Karol on Algeria, P. 2

Porter, Meyer and Byron Johnson Defeated, P. 4; How Belgium Is Taking Over Again in the Congo, P. 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 41 NOVEMBER 14, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

No Firm Majority, No Clear Mandate, No Real Verdict

The election returns seem to be as devoid of meaning as was the campaign. They cannot be hailed as a triumph over religious bigotry; anti-Catholicism swept the farm areas despite low prices; Kennedy would not have won without the Catholic vote in the Northeast. Nobody knew just what Kennedy stood for, but whatever it was the margin between him and Nixon—one third of one percent, as this was written—is too small to constitute a mandate for doing it. It had been hoped Kennedy might win without the South and that this election would weaken the one party system there, but of the Southern States only Virginia and Florida went for Nixon; Kennedy would not have won otherwise. The Democratic majorities of House and Senate will be as deceptive as ever for the key committee posts will still be held by Southern conservatives linked in their old oligarchic coalition with the Republicans. *Unless the rules are changed.*

No Evident Desire for Change

The election returns show no great desire for change, and as the excitement of our great quadrennial sports event dies down it appears that nothing *has* changed. But appearances may be deceptive. The actions of an Administration often bear little resemblance to the rallying cries on which it had won the election; Eisenhower's campaign pledge to substitute "liberation" for containment is a striking recent example. Now an elderly man with little interest in his job is to be replaced in the White House by an energetic young man. For good or evil, we are likely to have leadership instead of drift. We hope our misgivings about Kennedy will prove unjustified.

The prospect opening up before the new President would dismay the boldest character. He faces a series of crises without a hearty majority vote to give him moral support, and with the levers of power in Congress held by old and skilled enemies of social reform at home and new international initiatives abroad. A recession is underway. The chronic farm problem is worse than ever. The gold outflow has reached proportions where serious thought is called for. New crises are brewing over Berlin and Algeria; there will have to be a new summit; nuclear testing and disarmament call for new initiatives. Slow fuses are burning in Africa, in Southeast Asia, on the Formosa straits and in Central America, above all in Cuba, on which Kennedy spoke so foolishly in the campaign. New flareups are likely in the South over integration.

The first indication of where Kennedy intends to go will be evident of course in his Cabinet choices, particularly for Secretary of State; will it be a conventional stuffed shirt like David Bruce or a man of vision and capacity like Adlai Stevenson? But the first test of the new President will come with the opening of Congress. Will he choose to appease the Southern leadership, or use the patronage and prestige of a new Presidency to reform the rules so that majority decision and firm executive leadership are again possible? All else will depend on how Kennedy answers this question.

We believe it the duty of the liberals in the Democratic party not to wait. A program for reform of the rules is a first essential if platform pledges are to be kept; we again propose for December a National Conference To End Minority Rule of Congress. A program on peace and disarmament is equally urgent. In this connection, we are immensely cheered by the big majority which reelected Humphrey in Minnesota and look to him for the kind of intra-party leadership needed if a liberal Kennedy Administration is to be made possible.

On That 'Death Ray' Bomb

"Four of the nation's top scientists strongly disagreed yesterday with the statement by Thomas E. Murray, former AEC Commissioner, that the U.S. should resume underground nuclear tests to get ahead of the Soviet Union in the development of the so-called neutron or death-ray bomb. . . .

"Dr. Hans A. Bethe, professor of physics at Cornell . . . said 'This is another attempt to divert public opinion from the real issue to get a treaty that could lead to disarmament. . . . It is questionable that the bomb could be developed and I don't see that it would have a great advantage over the old-fashioned fission bomb, of which we have thousands.'

"Dr. Isidor I. Rabi, Nobel prize winner in physics, member of the President's Science Advisory Committee said: 'Mr. Murray doesn't know very much about atomic physics and is not technically qualified. . . .' Dr. Rabi said the public was being misled on the test question because of secrecy, which also prevented him 'from discussing these questions freely. . . .'

"'Irresponsible' was what Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner [MIT professor and Kennedy adviser] called Mr. Murray's statement. . . . 'I know of no reason for resuming testing immediately. My own view is that the U.S. cannot let any single thing hinder the negotiations. The use or leak of 'scare' stories inhibits the government in such talks,' Dr. Wiesner said. . . .

"Dr. David R. Inglis, former chairman of the Federation of American Scientists and senior physicist at the AEC's Argonne National Laboratory said Mr. Murray's description of the neutron bomb was "fantastically exaggerated.' The bomb, he said, was a 'scaling down of the A-bomb to a low efficiency to make it give out more neutron (short lived particles) radiation than blast damage.'"

—New York Herald-Tribune, Nov. 5.

This is the same death ray bomb scare story used by Dodd in his Senate speech for resumption of testing last May 12.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Algerian Referendum Under UN Control Termed Only Hope of Peace

De Gaulle's New Speech On Algeria as Seen from the French Left

By K. S. Karol

K. S. Karol, a Polish expatriate, has made a reputation in France by his brilliant journalism for L'Express and the London New Statesman, and by his book "Visa au Pologne." He is now covering the UN and we asked him to write us an article on de Gaulle's latest speech on Algeria. Too few Americans realize how quickly we could be drawn into war over Algeria if all hope of peace breaks down and Sino-Soviet "volunteers" make their appearance in the rebel forces.

General de Gaulle's new speech on Algeria dissipated the last illusions of his one-time faithful followers who believed that he was the best, if not the only French political leader capable of making peace in Algeria. While everything clearly indicates that Chinese and Russian assistance to the Algerian Government in Exile is leading toward military internationalization of the six-year old Algerian war, the President of the French Republic spoke as if he had time on his side and could afford to work patiently for an intermediate solution ultimately leading to an autonomous Algeria associated with France. He condemned indignantly the two "hostile packs" fighting against his policy, namely, the extreme-right champions of "Algerie Francaise" and the growing left-wing movement advocating the negotiation of an immediate peace. The latter, in his words, are guilty of preaching an "outright abandonment which would lead France to catastrophe."

This skillfully demagogic description is partly a by-product of de Gaulle's meglomania—all those who disagree with him are immediately bad Frenchmen. It is also a calculated attempt to influence American and Western public opinion. "De Gaulle," as one of his close friends defined him, "is a mixture of Jeanne d'Arc and a rug-merchant." His speech, threatening the bogey of "Soviet Algeria" if the FLN has its way, and promising a slow evolution toward a liberal and ultimately independent Algeria, is a case in point.

The Kind of Referendum They Distrust

The facts—which the major American papers seem to overlook—speak, nevertheless, against de Gaulle's whole conception; and if there is a real danger that Algeria might fall under Soviet influence while France would be delivered to a military dictatorship, it arises precisely from the stubborn refusal of the French President to negotiate *now* with Ferhat Abbas and his government. Beautifully worded sentences can no longer hide the truth. When de Gaulle says that the French Army will stop in Algeria and supervise a future referendum on self-determination, he sets a condition which only a defeated country in an act of desperation could accept. This is not, however, the case of the Algerian Nationalists. They feel stronger today than at any time since the beginning of the war and they didn't endure the deaths of more than 500,000 of their countrymen at the hands of the French Army for the privilege of casting a symbolic vote under a paratrooper's supervision. Therefore, all the promises and appeals to the Nationalists are in reality camouflaged calls for surrender, and de Gaulle must know that Ferhat Abbas would not accept them, even without the support of Mao-Tse-Tung and Khrushchov.

"I have two problems to solve simultaneously: the Army problem and Algeria," said de Gaulle to one of his ministers on the eve of his Friday speech (as reported by Jean Daniel in the Tunisian newspaper Afrique-Action), and the whole philosophy behind his actions is contained in this sentence. De Gaulle needs peace in Algeria and is aware that the survival of his regime depends largely on this issue. But he also wants to avoid a show-down with the army which put him in power in 1958 and which represents, in his eyes, a unifying force for the nation. Unfortunately for him, these two aims are self-contradictory. The part of the French Army which has joined sides with the French settlers in Algeria will not give up their virtual control of that country unless compelled to do so by massive pressure from Metropolitan France. The paratroop officers don't mind being called by de Gaulle "a pack of sterile immobilists" as long as they can do what they want and remain certain that the war will continue. But to be sure, they are carefully preparing a new 13 of May putsch with some extremist politician as Soustelle or Bidault, just in case de Gaulle makes a real move toward negotiations with Ferhat Abbas. But they do not represent a very significant section of the public opinion. Few, even among the rightists in France, are eager for a Massu-Salan-Soustelle regime. But they are counting on the division within the ranks of their enemies, and a natural fear of Civil War.

By placing on the same level the great popular movement for honest peace negotiations and a handful of extremists, de Gaulle is not only misleading the world public opinion, but is isolating himself from the very forces which could protect France from a Fascist attempt.

I believe with Jean-Paul Sartre that the fundamental factors involved in French politics are now the same as in 1958. Part of the army wants war, while France wants peace; but the military cilque threatens a putsch if it doesn't have its way, and no one dares to call its bluff. I say bluff, because I think that a majority of the officers would think twice before undertaking this kind of action, and the 20,000 paratroopers, (the real striking force of the extreme faction) are not enough to take control of France. And ironically enough, some military experts claim that if these troops (and the foreign legion) would invade Paris in order to keep Algeria French, they would lose the very object of the battle, for the Algerian Nationalists would have little trouble, in their absence, in defeating the conscript army.

De Gaulle's Sour View of the Army

De Gaulle himself is on the record as saying: "The Army has no political brain. It was against Dreyfus and for Petain. Each of its interventions was a mistake. You can surround the Elysees with paratroopers, but what then?" But he is not the man to force a showdown with this "brainless" force and he doesn't want to depend on the popular support of the Left-Wing forces. He believes that time, and a growing formation of the new Moslem pro-French elite will automatically lead to some compromise settlement. He admits privately that he counts more on the next generation of Algerians than the present one.

I don't think that the climate of the war, with tortures and concentration camps, is propitious for the growth of a middle-of-the-road elite. But even were I to accept this theory, I would wonder how de Gaulle can plan generations ahead when he faces a new phase of the war in the next few weeks. The Moroccans and the Tunisians have already announced that the forthcoming arrival of the heavy Chinese and Russian armaments will completely change the very nature of the present struggle. For the first time the Algerians will have the means to break the Ligne Morice which paralyzes the communications between their forces stationed in Tunisia and the Maquis. The two Maghreb countries are apparently not afraid of French retaliation for accepting Chinese and Russian arms on their territory.

De Gaulle continues to ignore the fact that the Algerian war is politically and militarily an international one. The Western liberals should consider that the only way to avoid disaster for both France and the West is to accept the Algerian proposal of a free referendum under U.N. control. This is precisely what "the pack of agitators" is fighting for in France, led by the best forces of French youth and French intellectuals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will We Soon Join the Russians in Asking a 3-Man Secretariat, Too, to Veto Mr. H?

U.S. Now Supporting Belgium in Undercutting the UN in the Congo

Those with a taste for cynical flavors will enjoy the striking resemblance between the arguments used by Mr. Zorin of the USSR before the Security Council on September 14 on Russia's right to give the Congo aid outside the framework of the UN and those put forward by Belgium in its note of October 28 to Secretary General Hammarskjold.

Hammarskjold No Longer Our Hero

Both insisted that to require all technical aid to be channelled through the UN would be an interference with the sovereign rights of an independent state. The difference is that the Russians were giving aid to the lawfully constituted government of the Congo while the Belgians have been supporting various groups at the center and in the provinces which are trying to prevent reestablishment of the parliamentary regime. The Russian and Belgian actions were alike, however, in threatening to undercut the hope of insulating the Congo from the cold war. The important difference is that while the U.S. made a hero of Hammarskjold for rebuffing the Russians, our State Department has leaped into action to criticize the UN command for trying to stop the Belgians. Not many weeks have passed since Mr. Eisenhower announced that our policy was to support the UN, but like other powers great and small we seem to like the UN only when it does our bidding. If Mr. Hammarskjold continues to demand that the Belgians cease their efforts (see box below) to take over the Congo from within, we shall soon be joining the Russians in proposing a 3-headed secretariat so we can have a veto handy, too, over Mr. Hammarskjold.

That Belgian technicians can play a useful role in the Congo is admitted, but not if they are part of a take-over operation outside the framework of the UN. The State Department release of November 4 is designed to hide the real nature of Belgian operations in the Congo. Africans and Asians will assume that we are conniving with the Belgians. The Congo needs UN tutelage but this will be acceptable to the Afro-Asians only if the UN operates through and with a parliamentary regime, and not through a military dictatorship stage-managed by the West. The Dayal report criticizes the Belgians for inviting Congolese military officers to Belgium for training; if the Russians did this there would be an outcry. But the U.S. is open to the same criticism for bringing here 11 Congolese officers from the army of Mobutu, whom we had hoped to convert into a Congolese Batista.* This is also aid outside the framework of the UN with the political purpose of undermining the parliamentary regime which we fear might reinstal Lumumba.

The U.S. press continues to remain silent on the Rockefeller interests in the Katanga, and the role these interests are playing behind the scenes to obtain a Congolese government amenable to them. Their latest hope is Kasavubu, who made a lamb-like debut at the UN. How establish law and order in a new country when our government maneuvers so openly to obtain a puppet regime?

That Strong Man Army Regime

"Since the assumption of power by their Chief of Staff Mobuto on 4 September, these undisciplined ANC Congolese National Army troops, lacking any coherent control, have been drawn into the vortex of political strife. Their lawless actions have had varying and sometimes contradictory political motivations. . . . The ANC command in Leopoldville denies authorization for many of the acts of lawlessness committed by ANC personnel. The very fact of the denial is conclusive evidence of the complete absence of control. Even in Leopoldville itself, the ANC troops are not under any single effective command and the Chief of Staff himself has sought and long enjoyed the protection of UN troops. . . . Far from the ANC providing any measure of security or stability, it became the principal fomentor of lawlessness."

—Dayal report to Hammarskjold, Nov. 2.

***According to a story in the New York Herald-Tribune Nov. 5 these visiting officers refused at Fort Dix even to touch the new M-14 rifles being shown them. One of them said, "We are soldiers, yes, but we want to build a country, not kill our brothers." What can one do with such primitives?**

How the Belgians Are Slowly Taking Over Control of the Congo Again

"There is clear evidence of the steady return, in recent weeks, of Belgians to the Congo, and within this framework, of increasing Belgian participation in political and administrative activities . . . Belgian military and paramilitary personnel as well as civilian personnel continue to be available to authorities in the Congo. . . .

"Soon after a measure of security had been re-established in the Congo, a recruiting agency for the Congo was set up in Brussels . . . the object of the agency seems to be to assist in re-establishing a civil service of Belgian nationality principally at the policy level. . . .

"As a result of the concerted activities of the recruiting agency, the task of ONUC [United Nations Organization for the Congo] has been made more difficult. For example, in the Ministry of Economic Co-ordination and Planning, the Chef de Cabinet Adjoint has been responsible for delaying the submission of applications for U.N. technical aid. . . . Similarly in other ministries, co-operation with ONUC, vital to its smooth functioning, has been hampered in various ways by high-ranking Belgians. . . .

"U.N. documents and reports have frequently been withheld from the Congolese officials in the ministries, and propaganda has been engineered regarding the supposed dangers of the emergence of U.N. trusteeship. . . .

"Belgian influence is also seen in the military field. A Belgian colonel, who recently arrived from Brazzaville, acts as an adviser to the Leopoldville Ministry of National Defense, while a former Belgian warrant officer serves as aide de camp to Colonel Mobutu, with the rank of captain. Thirty-six Congolese, recently promoted to second lieutenants, have been sent by Colonel Mobutu to Brussels for military training.

"In Katanga, Belgian influence is omnipresent. Virtually all key civilian and security posts are either held directly by officials of Belgian nationality or controlled by advisers to recently appointed and often inexperienced Congolese officials . . . within the security forces, there are 114 Belgian officers and 117 Belgians of other ranks in the Gendarmerie, and 58 Belgian officers in the police. . . . In the so-called 'Autonomous State of South Kasai' there is also a considerable Belgian presence. The current emphasis there is on warlike preparations directed by a Colonel Crevecoeur, serving in Belgian uniform. . . .

"Belgian activities in recent weeks have increased the intransigeance of the ANC [Congolese army] command as well as of the Katangese authorities, inhibited peaceful political activity and therefore the possibility of an eventual return to constitutional government."

—The Situation in the Republic of the Congo, Report from Ambassador Dayal to Secretary General Hammarskjold, Nov. 2

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Seven Members of Liberal Project and Many Other House Progressives Reelected

Chas. Porter and "Peace Congressmen" Meyer and Johnson Defeated

The worst news of the campaign was the defeat of five members of the 12-man so-called Liberal Project which had sought to be a ginger group within the Democratic party, including the two "peace Congressmen" Byron Johnson of Colorado and Wm. H. Meyer of Vermont, and Charles O. Porter of Oregon.

Both Johnson and Porter were defeated in Red smear campaigns. The former, with a distinguished record as an economist and political scientist, was called soft on communism for having advocated recognition of Red China. Mr. Porter, after four years in the House where he had distinguished himself by his courage particularly on Latin American affairs, was attacked for being friendly to Castro.

Mr. Meyer, a professional forester, the first Democrat to be elected from Vermont in many years, won two years ago on a platform calling for recognition of Peking. This year he was the victim of a Republican sweep in northern New England which also retired the two Democratic Congressmen from Maine though neither had the disadvantage of unconventional views. Actually Mr. Meyer ran ahead of Kennedy while his successful opponent, former Governor Stafford, ran behind Nixon. Mr. Porter's two terms were memorable for his championship of better relations with Latin America and his one-man campaign against Trujillo; Mr. Johnson and Mr. Meyer were badly needed voices for a saner foreign policy. We hope all three will be back soon.

The other two members of the Liberal Project defeated were Leonard G. Wolf, victim of the anti-Catholic undercurrent which swept Iowa into the Republican column despite steadily declining farm income, and George A. Kasem of Los Angeles, the first Congressman of Arab American origin. Both Wolf and Kasem were thoughtful and enlightened men.

We note with pleasure that seven other members of the Liberal Project were reelected: Clem Miller and James Roosevelt of California; Kastenmeier and Reuss of Wisconsin; Moorhead of Pennsylvania; James O'Hara of Michigan and Frank Thompson of New Jersey. We regret the defeat of three other progressives; Roy Wier of Minnesota, often during his 12 years in Congress the only vote against the Un-American Activities Committee, victim of a well financed campaign by General Mills; Randall S. Harmon of Indiana and James M. Quigley of Pennsylvania, the latter both defeated by the anti-Catholic undertow in rural areas.

We note with pleasure the reelection to the House of a goodly number of progressives: Stewart Udall of Arizona; Jeff Cohelan, John F. Shelley and B. F. Sisk of California; Frank Kowalski and Robert N. Giaimo of Connecticut; Barrett O'Hara and Sidney Yates of Illinois; John Brademas of Indiana; John Blatnik of Minnesota; John V. Lindsay, an able young Republican from New York City; Charles A. Vanik of Ohio; Edith Green of Oregon, and Ken Hechler of West Va.

Hardly A Moral Victory

We were not present at the UN when it voted on the Cuban request that its complaint of U.S. intervention and aggression be placed before the plenary session of the General Assembly but the transcript of the debate and the final vote show that this affair was hardly a moral victory for the U.S. The Cuban motion was voted down by 45 to 29 with 18 abstentions, i.e. by a majority of those present. Of the 88 non-Communist members of the Assembly, a bare majority of one was mustered for the U.S. Burma, India and Ethiopia, while expressing no opinion on the merits of the Cuban complaint, supported Cuba (as Burma phrased it) in "sincere belief that when a small country brings up a charge against a very powerful neighboring country of having the intent to aggress, that charge should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly as promptly as possible." Of our Latin American neighbors only two spoke up, Guatemala and Costa Rica, but neither defended U.S. policy. Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela and Bolivia were among the abstainers. Of the new African States, only Madagascar voted against Cuba. Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Negal, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia and Ceylon voted for the Cuban motion. The U.S. victory shunted the complaint to the Political Committee where it may not be reached for some weeks.

IFS Speaks on the Congressional Witch Hunt at Washington University, St. Louis, Nov. 17, and on the Cuba and Congo Crises at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Nov. 18

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

11/14/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; 6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED